HD
6511
.M2

MACARTHUR. TRADE UNIONS EPIGRAMS. HD6511.M2

BANCROFT
LIBRARY

✧

THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA

TRADE UNION EPIGRAMS

BY
WALTER MACARTHUR

SOME REASONS FOR THE FAITH THAT IS WITHIN US

ISSUED BY
THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR
WASHINGTON, D. C.
1904

HD 6511
.M2

56541

Bancroft Library

TRADE UNION EPIGRAMS,

By WALTER MACARTHUR.

Man's first duty is to organize.

Labor will never realize its rights until it recognizes its wrongs.

The labor movement is a thing not of idealism but of instinct.

The "spirit of organization" and the "spirit of progress" are interchangeable terms.

The record of trade unionism shows that, after all, man was not made to mourn.

The necessity of industrial organization knows no law except that of human progress.

Next to the family, the trade union is the highest exemplification of the gregarious instinct.

Trade unionism that is not purely practical and simply sensible is not trade unionism at all.

The extent of trade unionism is the best possible measure of a people's capacity for self-government.

In trade unionism, as in other human activities, success oftenest attends those who know how to wait—and work.

In the coming age of complete industrial organization international boundary lines will cease to be even imaginary.

Trade unionism, like Time, knows neither beginning nor end. It is the Genesis and Revelations of the human soul.

The need of the moment is not so much for the formation of new unions as for new members in those unions already formed.

As we see in the rainbow the harbinger of fine weather, so labor may see the glories of its future through its tears.

Organized labor too often commits the common error of neglecting its friends in order the more sedulously to cultivate its enemies.

Labor is a necessity to human existence; being such, it is obvious that under natural conditions it should be a pleasure, not a penance.

The trade union is a standing challenge to that miserable old cynicism, "Every man for himself, and the devil take the hindmost."

The trade union is the prime conservator of individual liberty, as distinguished from the political club, the conservator of public liberty.

As we contemplate the progress of trade unionism among the workers of the world even the millennium seems not impossible of attainment.

When a man tires at the "slow progress" of the labor movement a good recipe is to stand off a bit and survey the work actually accomplished.

After all, the "labor question" is but an arithmetical question. Unfortunately, however, we still lack agreement upon the formula by which to solve it.

As a tree is strengthened by pruning, so the labor movement may be improved by cutting out those elements that properly belong in some other movement.

The most powerful labor organization is that which in addition to the ability to "put up a fight" has the brains to put up a good argument in justification or prevention of the last resort.

Gift macarthur estate 1-10-45

The tendency of trade unions, as of other bodies of men, to act upon sentiment rather than reason, would be more dangerous than it is, were it not for the intervention of that strongest of all forces, instinct.

Where the respective limits of any given trades are recognized there is no room for dispute regarding the jurisdiction of each. Any dispute that does occur in such case may be safely referred to extraneous causes.

A certain philosopher has said that "instinct guided by reason is never wrong." This observation explains much of the success of trade unionism, which is primarily an expression of the instinct of self-preservation.

The history of the labor movement will repeat its successes oftener and its failures seldomer whenever the laborer learns to accept experience as a gift from the past instead of insisting upon purchasing it with his own good coin.

Those who regret the limitations of the trade union movement may find some consolation in the reflection that, after all, the only movement that has not fallen short of the highest hopes is that which has not yet been put to the test of practice.

The final limit of the power of trade unionism is the limit of the capacity of working men and women to perceive that their interests can be conserved only by that form of organization—in other words, the limit of the numbers organized.

The line of demarcation between trade unions that properly embrace men of different callings and those that should contain only men of a particular craft lies between those callings that are interchangeable, i. e., at which certain men work by turns, and those to which men are exclusively confined. In the former case the workers may, and in fact should, organize together; in the latter they should organize separately.

The most valuable lessons that trade unionism can learn are the lessons of patience and mobility—the lesson of how to wait for victory and the lesson of how to change a position in a fight.

The labor movement should be guarded against the growth that results in repletion. Strength and vitality depend upon preserving a mean between the weakness of small, and the lethargy of large, bodies.

The strength of organized labor lies in its weakness. That which it lacks in power of compulsion it gains by appeal to rational human ambition and intelligent perception of right and wrong. Right enjoined by force becomes wrong, and therefore fails.

In a state of universal organization among the workers one meal would be worth all the money in the world. In that event the advantage would lie with the stomach most inured to abstention. In other words, hunger would be the ally, not the enemy, of the workers.

A disposition on the part of a trade union to talk with its employers is no sign of its inability to adopt other means of securing justice if need be. And, per contra, the trade union that denies or ignores the wisdom of conferring whenever possible generally displays little stomach for sterner methods when forced to meet them.

To say that the creator is greater than the created is well enough as a generalization, but we should be careful not to use that saying in justification of conditions the tendencies of which are in their nature uncontrollable. For instance, we should not say that the creator of a fire in a powder magazine is greater than the thing actually created, i. e., the explosion that follows as a natural sequence. So, in industrial affairs a body of free and intelligent men may easily enough create a condition of affairs that will inevitably reduce them to a state of helplessness.

Morals of the Strike.

The manhood of the striker must take precedence of the comfort of the public.

A strike always succeeds in proportion as it demonstrates the unprofitableness of war.

It is only in the case of a strike that we appreciate the full depth of the employer's regard for the sanctity of contract.

Reformers generally would succeed better if they were to give less attention to the effects of the strike and more to the causes thereof.

A strike always succeeds in proportion as it arouses thought, particularly on the part of those who are disposed to condemn it thoughtlessly.

You can not reform the physical conditions of being by means solely intellectual any more than you can appease hunger by reading a menu.

Those who describe the strike as a measure of "brute force" should remember that, after all, nothing is accomplished by thought or talk alone.

The statistics of the losses due to strikes would be less formidable and more instructive if they could be set off by the value of manhood saved in the issue.

No man can ever gain an understanding of the labor movement as long as he harbors the fallacy that the strike or boycott is a creation of the "labor leader."

Ultimate success in a labor struggle does not always depend upon the ability to continue fighting. Not infrequently it is the ability to quit that decides the issue.

If Abraham Lincoln were alive to-day he would probably say: "Thank God, we have a labor movement that can sustain a strike until it accomplishes something."

Generally speaking, "respect for the rights of the third party," as that phrase is used in connection with strikes, implies disrespect for the rights of the other two parties.

That species of public sympathy with the demands of strikers which flies to the other side at the first sign of a break in the peace is in effect a particularly pernicious form of hostility.

The man who knows least about the strike talks loudest about its evils. The man who knows most about the strike most clearly perceives the "soul of good in things miscalled evil."

The best regulated labor organization is that which most clearly distinguishes between the time for talk and the time for fight—which fights with all its power and when it quits, stays quit.

The "innocent third party" has its rights in the case of a strike, of course. But it has no right to compel the resumption of work by the strikers in order simply that it may be spared inconvenience.

If one body of men have a right to quit work to compel a necessary improvement in the conditions of their lives, no other body of men can have a right to take their places. The court of morals takes no cognizance of the right to scab.

A strike is a method, and frequently the only effectual one, of protesting against injustice. If the public could be got to take action upon a mere statement of the facts they would have less occasion to complain of the hardship inflicted by strikes upon "the innocent third party."

The strike, so far from proving a backward state of civilization, is indeed the final test of a people's progress toward true liberty. The extent of a nation's advancement may be judged exactly by the extent to which its people are guaranteed the right to strike and to which that right is exercised.

Whether the immediate object be gained or not, a justifiable strike always succeeds in proportion as it attracts public attention. In this view it sometimes happens that the very failure of the immediate object is an element of success, since thereby the evils complained of are the more clearly demonstrated.

Even those persons who oppose the strike on general principles show a disposition to modify their views whenever they realize that a given strike has succeeded, if only in part. If these persons could be brought to realize that almost all strikes succeed in part they would also realize that the general principle upon which their opposition to the strike is based is merely a lack of discernment of the strike's real significance.

Compulsory Arbitration.

Compulsory arbitration is compulsory servitude.

Compulsory arbitration: The strangest god in the empyrean of the longed-for.

The compulsory arbitrationist would cure the disease by killing the patient.

No government can be free which assumes to dictate the disposition of man's labor.

There may be much to arbitrate, but there never will be anything arbitrated between the strong and the weak.

The compulsory arbitrationist should remember that the government, like fire, is a good servant but a bad master.

It is quite in keeping with the fitness of things that compulsory arbitration should find its highest acceptation in the land of the boomerang.

Arbitration is the alternative of war. It will never be more than an unattainable ideal to those who are unwilling or unable to put up a fight.

The man who cites compulsory arbitration as a remedy for strikes might with equal propriety cite the balloon as a contradiction of the laws of gravity.

It is hardly necessary to say that abolishing an evil and suppressing the complaint about it are entirely different, and, in fact, antithetical, propositions.

To understand clearly the significance of compulsory arbitration in the interest of the public we have but to recall Æsop's fable of the monkey, the cat, and the cheese.

The principle of compulsory arbitration, i. e., enforced labor, may with equal propriety be extended to enforce idleness, to enforce starvation—in other words, to inflict death.

Arbitration is a business, not a moral, proposition. It will grow in favor with the employer in proportion as the employe demonstrates his ability to make the other method the more costly.

The compulsory arbitrationist who would have wages fixed by law probably flatters himself that he is ahead of his generation. In reality he is merely the re-embodied spirit of an age long past.

Take from man the right to quit work at his own pleasure, and you take from him that attribute which, next to the right to light itself, marks the difference between the human and the lower animal.

Almost anybody can see a difference between arbitration compelled by active public opinion and arbitration compelled by the employer and administered by the employer's court.

Honorable terms is the predicate of arbitration, consequently there can be no need of physical compulsion in the acceptance of that resort. "Compulsory arbitration" is compulsion, as opposed to arbitration.

A trade union without the right and power to strike is an anomaly. A trade union, the chief use of which is to make a strike impossible, as under the compulsory arbitration system, is a crime against common sense.

Skim it, strain it, and apply the microscope, and you will find that the real sentiment of the compulsory arbitrationist is pure selfishness—the selfishness that takes its own belly as the criterion of good or evil in all things.

The idea that compulsory arbitration laws encourage the organization of the workers amounts in fact to the paradox of organizing the workers for the primary object of destroying the very power that makes organization itself worth while.

In the logical view, the trade union is organized for peace, with the strike as an ever-present means of securing it upon honorable terms. In the compulsory arbitrationist's view the trade union is organized for peace, with the dictum and authority of a court to maintain it upon any terms. The only purpose actually served by such an organization is to insure at least the appearance of common consent to a judicial despotism that otherwise would be intolerable.

The objection to compulsory arbitration lies not so much in the fear of injustice as in the dislike of being forced to accept even justice at the hands of the Government. We prefer the injustice of our own making to the justice of an assumed master.

We have a great deal of sympathy but very little respect for the order of intellect that can see no difference between the compulsion of a court and the compulsion of a trade union in the regulation of the employe's relations with the employer.

Conciliation and arbitration are, of course, well worth seeking. In the present imperfect state of industrial morals, however, it is apparent that the hope of attaining these ends lies chiefly in the power of either or both parties to fall back upon the sterner alternative.

When we reflect that one of the chief purposes of the trade union is to restrain the aggressiveness of the Government, the idea of the compulsory arbitrationist that the Government should be vested with authority to supersede the other chief purposes of trade unionism is a striking instance of inconsistency.

It is a grievous error to say, as do the friends of compulsory arbitration, that because that system is applied only to organized workers, it is an adjunct and support of trade unionism. As well might it be said that because the law hangs only the murderer, it is an adjunct and support of murder! The fact is that compulsory arbitration is applied only to trade unions because only they can make a strike successful as a means of suspending industry. The individual employer is his own "arbitrator" in the case of the unorganized workers.

The Shorter Workday.

A store closed early is a store run easily.

An hour off the day's labor is an hour added to the day's life.

It is inevitable that the man who works at night should think only in the dark.

The reduction of the hours of labor increases production by virtue of the law that demand increases supply.

The early closing of stores makes for the earlier opening of the rational era in the lives of the store workers.

The movement to reduce the hours of labor will continue as long as labor itself continues to be merely physical exertion for the maintenance of animal existence.

The shorter workday is the most important question before the labor movement, and will continue to be such, because it is the simplest and most direct way of adjusting the problem of distribution.

The basis of the shorter workday movement is recognition of the truth that man does not live to work, but works to live.

A working day that leaves no interval between work and sleep would reduce man to the state of the animal—that is, the draught animal.

The shorter workday movement will continue to "move" as long as human nature retains its essential characteristic, i. e., "the desire for more." And it will continue to succeed as long as human nature itself succeeds.

The lessening of the daily hours of labor increases the total of products by increasing the opportunity and disposition for consuming them. The sum of the difference between a savage and a civilized state is merely the difference between men who have time and inclination to gratify their physical needs only, and men who have time, inclination, and determination to indulge and cultivate the intellectual side of their nature.

Child Labor.

The employer of child labor is a homicide on the wholesale.

Speaking literally as well as figuratively, child labor is child murder.

The difference between child labor and convict labor is mainly a matter of age.

If there were fewer slaving children there would also be fewer idling parents.

Every child sacrificed to the factory system is a potential rebel against all forms of industry.

We should not be surprised if the child who is tied to a machine develops a case of "wheels" in after life.

The agitation against child labor is simply a movement to re-establish the natural order in family affairs.

It is rather unfortunate that the laws against infanticide were established before the crime of child labor had become an issue.

If Tom Hood had lived in the Southern States he would probably have chosen the child worker as the theme of his "Song."

Those parents who are forced to depend for support upon their children do not necessarily love them the more on that account.

Not "What has posterity done for us?" but "What will posterity do to us?" is the question that statesmanship may well consider in its treatment of the child labor evil.

The attempt to jusify child labor by pleading the "laziness of the parents" is insult added to subterfuge.

If we are to believe that one's ideals are the reflex of early training, it is to be hoped that those of the factory child will never be realized.

The factory child, denied the right to learn to play, is the progenitor of the man who can do no more than toy with the most serious affairs.

It is not to be expected that a child brought up under the restraints of factory labor will develop a very high regard for liberty of any kind.

It must not be assumed that the child who receives its only education while tending a machine will necessarily develop a machine-like obedience to driving power.

Gradgrind himself shines as a sentimentalist in comparison with the Southerner who insists that the children should be put in the factory instead of in the school.

The penchant for child labor displayed by employers in the South seems to indicate the need of a new definition of chivalry, as applied to employers of that section.

The employer of child labor who reads his Bible probably regards with regret the assurance of the Savior that the Kingdom of Heaven is composed mainly of children, since he can not hope to start a factory or in any other way "invest capital" there.

The Piece-Work System.

In practice, "piece-work" and "part payment" are synonymous terms.

The larger the wage by the "piece," the smaller the wage by the "whole."

Overtime and piece-work are the twin devices by which individual greed is used to degrade the mass.

The piece-work system is easily understood. The worker who is paid by the piece receives only a piece of the sum actually earned.

It is paradoxical but true that were it not for the establishment of the minimum wage all wages would be down to the lowest possible point.

In discussing wages, cheapness should not be confounded with economy. These terms are incompatible and inconsistent.

By establishing a minimum wage the trade union lays a foundation from which all wages rise. Without that bedrock all wages must inevitably sink.

Low living results inevitably in low wages. It is customary with the thoughtless to hold up the man who saves out of a small wage by denying himself the necessaries and decencies of life. Such a man is not a model, but a warning to his fellows, since his example, if generally followed, would reduce all to the lowest possible standard of living.

The Union Label.

The union label: The insignia of industrial decency.

The trade-mark stands for the trader; the union label for the tradesman.

You can always tell a union man by the coat that he wears—if it bears the union label.

To know a product made under fair conditions, if you see the union label on it, it's so.

The simple announcement that an article bears the union label is all the advertisement needed by the consumer who cares for principle as well as for price.

Give an article a union label and you may be sure it is "just as advertised."

As a preventative of strikes nothing has yet been discovered which exceeds in potency the union label.

The thrifty housewife should be careful that in buying at a bargain she isn't selling somebody's job at a sacrifice.

As a preventative of strikes and boycotts the union label is simplicity itself. A child can operate it—that is, ask for it.

The union label on any product is a guarantee that the money paid for it will return to the consumer, with interest, in the form of improved social surroundings.

Government by Injunction.

In the case of the injunction in labor disputes, contempt of court is respect for law.

The "injunction judge" who would be respected should take care that he respects the law in his own practice.

The injunction against the boycott is a negation of the first principles of free government, i. e., the right of petition.

The man who is enjoined from doing a thing that is lawful may be depended upon to do that thing, if only as a means of vindicating the law.

Some day our injunction judges will wake up and find the whole world in revolt against their assumption of superiority to all law, natural as well as statutory.

Injunctions against the boycott, being powerless to compel patronage of unfair concerns, will always be futile as long as the spirit of fair play exists among men and women.

The injunction judge who cares to know how he stands in public estimation can get a fairly reliable line on the point by reading the jokes about him now going the rounds of the funny papers.

Bancroft Library

The Labor Press.

The labor press is labor's only reliable preceptor.

The power of the labor press inheres in the fact that it is not only with the workers but of them.

Comparatively speaking, the labor editor is the most potent figure in all the range of journalism. With care, his power for good is great; with carelessness, his power for harm is still greater.

The labor press will not begin to be the power it should be until the people in whose interests it is published begin to show it a little of the deference and respect that they now bestow upon the press of their opponents.

The labor press is the only remaining free press.

Every new labor paper established is a new outpost of the workers' army, a guidon planted nearer the goal.

If the intellect were as highly developed as is the instinct we would seldomer witness the absurdity of the working class seeking its pabulum in the columns of the daily press.

The merit of a labor paper is proved more by the amount of matter stolen from its columns than by the amount that is reprinted with credit. As imitation is the sincerest form of flattery, so literal appropriation is the strongest admission of worth.

Union Industry.

"Union Industry" stands always for happier homes; "Home Industry" stands too frequently for dirtier sweatshops.

The term "Home Industry" is common property, but only a fair employer can use the term "Union Industry" as an advertisement in his business. For that reason the latter is the only term that the trade unionist can use with safety to the interests of the union.

"Patronize Home Industry" is primarily an appeal in the interest of the employer. "Patronize Union Industry" appeals always in the name of the employe.

The Labor Leader.

Too many trade unionists would have the old maxim read: "An injury to me is the concern of all."

Consistency is a jewel which the trade unionist may, and indeed should, display as conspicuously as possible.

We can not lay too much stress upon the difference between the union man and the member of a union.

Regular attendance at the meetings of the union is as good a criterion as any of the spirit that really dominates the members.

Even philosophy, which conquers everything but toothache, is put to hard straits at times in the life of the "labor leader."

Fortunately for his efficiency, the "labor leader" is under no obligation to take to heart the slurs of his enemies inside and outside the ranks of labor.

The member who assumes what he is pleased to call the middle ground in debate too frequently does so in order to hide his ignorance of either of the other grounds.

The "labor leader" who wobbles under abuse and misconstruction from friend or foe can generally find the cause of his instability in the fact that his boots are too big for him.

Nature provides a compensation for every misfortune. The internecine troubles of the labor movement keep us from worrying about our troubles with the natural enemy.

The labor movement does not lack for men who can point out the promise of the future. What it too frequently does lack is the man who remembers and respects the lessons of the past.

Strict attention to one's own business is commendable; but the trade unionist should beware of carrying the rule so far as to refuse the attention he owes to the business of his fellow-workers.

The man who talks about the "sacrifices" he has made for the labor movement usually spends most of his energies in the effort to "get back his own"—and as much more as possible.

In taking advantage of the "spirit of organization," organizers should be guarded against creating elements that tend toward the segregation rather than the cohesiveness of the labor movement.

If men would adhere strictly to the sound rules of practice in trade unionism, as they do to the rules of arithmetic, we should witness fewer instances of division and subtraction under the guise of addition.

It is gratifying to reflect that much of the so-called dissension in the ranks of organized labor is but the inevitable accompaniment and evidence of the vital force within the movement. The dead alone present a perfectly peaceful exterior.

Possibly the tenement-house cigar manufacturer advertises his weeds by the name of "Robert Burns," "Tom Moore," "Henry George," or other friend of humanity, as a salve to the conscience of those members of organized labor who smoke them.

The view of the majority is always right, since it alone can be put into practice. The view of the minority can never be more than a theory incapable of demonstration.

However regrettable the internecine troubles of the trade unions, there remains the consolation that at the crucial moment the opposition of the common enemy will force them to make common cause.

The "labor leader" who fully appreciates the responsibility of his office is to be commended; but the "labor leader" who falls into the error of regarding himself as indispensable is in need of a severe corrective.

When we are inclined to be impatient of the small-mindedness that sometimes crops up in the labor movement we should reflect that, after all, the fact is a compliment to the intensely human character of the institution.

As a man may be loved for the enemies he has made, so the "labor leader" who is not the subject of denunciation, libel, and misconstruction from certain sources is justly open to suspicion regarding his disinterestedness.

The man who is inclined at times to regard himself as the "whole cheese" in the labor movement may find something worth while in the reflection that after all he is merely a mite—a creature born of the movement's age and strength.

There isn't much to choose between the union man who regards the payment of dues as his sole obligation to organized labor and the non-union man who assumes no obligation at all—and what choice there is favors the latter, rather.

The disposition to indulge in personalities in the treatment of trade union affairs is a proof of that egotism that puts the individual above the mass. The egotist should remember that even if all the charges against the other fellow were true, it would make no difference in the end. The trade union, being grounded upon the necessities of the workers' existence, will pursue its way serene, indifferent, oblivious to individual perfection or frailty.

It is well that we should draw a clear distinction between the member who displays a great deal of enthusiasm in debate and the member who merely evinces a bad temper.

It has been well said that indifference is incompatible with love. The same may as truthfully be said with reference to all other phases of mental absorption. For instance, the so-called calmness of the debater on any subject of importance usually proves nothing more than lack of interest in the result.

The criticism of the "labor leader" on the ground of his failure to lead his union into politics is rather a compliment to his attentiveness to his own business.

The man who boasts of being the "father of the union" should be guarded against allowing his parental solicitude to become like that of the mother who remains always afraid lest her boy will go too near the water. Unions, like children, grow to years of discretion, when they must for their own good be allowed to exercise it.

Labor and Politics.

It is the worker, not the voter, who governs the conditions of labor.

It is the universal experience that the union that goes into politics goes into trouble.

By their votes men may declare for a good government, but it is only by their labor that they can realize that object.

Take care of the economic interests, and the moral, social, and political interests will take care of themselves.

Much of the asseveration that the unions should go into politics means merely that the members thereof, or certain of these, should go into office.

In point of practicability the advice to "strike at the ballot-box" amounts to much the same thing as advice to the man in a storm to seek shelter under the plans of a house.

Nothing in the future is more nearly certain than that those who can not govern their own affairs as workers will never be able to govern the affairs of the country as patriots.

The trade union that goes into politics resembles an anchored balloon, controllable only in proportion as it is tied down by forces which offset the natural tendency to fly away.

To us it seems rather remarkable that the man who believes most profoundly in the potency of politics should be so intensely incredulous, not to say cynical, on almost every other subject.

The power of the workers is not in their votes but in their productive capacity. And in the last resort that power can be demonstrated only by ceasing to produce. Those who argue against the strike, per se, may find profit in this reflection.

The man who would have the trade unions experiment with "political action" would experiment in his own person with gravitation but for the risk to his bones. He forgets, or cares not, that the trade union, too, has bones that may be broken.

Upon reflection it will be observed that the difference between the good and the bad politician is merely the difference between the politician on the platform and the politician in office. In this, as in most other matters, opportunity is the final test.

In politics the minority of the voters, no matter how great their numbers, can accomplish nothing. In trade unionism the minority of the workers, though comparatively few in numbers, as it happens, have made their influence felt materially upon every phase of labor's existence.

The idea that all economic questions may be solved by the ballot, "which registers the freeman's will as lightning does the will of God," is one of the most remarkable crotchets of the times. We can not imagine such a state of beatitude, and we would not hope for it if we could. There is this difference between the will of the freeman and the will of God—there is but one God, while there are many freemen, each with a will of his own and a strong disposition to do more than merely register it.

Labor and the Government.

If there were no servile men there would be no despotic governments.

Every additional function vested in the Government is a step backward toward despotism.

Society is always in greater danger from its own weakness than from the Government's tyranny.

Labor does not ask the Government to better its conditions, but simply to give it a chance to do that for itself.

In proportion as the workers help themselves by the power of trade unionism there is the less need of help from the law-making powers and the less disappointment because of failure on the part of the latter.

If all lawbreakers were behind bars there would be fewer administrators of law and also less need for those.

A militia and a standing army may look brave enough and prove effective enough in deterring or suppressing any offensive movement among the people. But opposed to a people roused to the defense of their liberties the entire institutions of militarism would be as chaff in a gale.

We are apt to credit with too much virtue the maxim that "all government rests upon physical force." No amount of force can for long maintain government in opposition to the will of the people; no force is required to maintain government in accord with that will.

The "Friend of Labor."

The only entirely reliable "Friend of Labor" is labor itself.

Organized labor has need to distinguish clearly between its friends and its mere favorites.

When labor is true to itself it will have no further need to ask favors of its "friends." It will then command justice of itself.

A man's friendship for organized labor may be better judged by his disposition to stay in the background at certain times than by his willingness to come to the front at others.

When the workers acquire the virtue of self-dependence a great many "friends of labor" will have to adopt some other profession.

The organized workers will do well to question the disinterestedness of those friends who appear only in times of prosperity or excitement.

The real friend of labor shows his friendliness by granting the claim of the workers to know most about their own affairs. The professional in that line is known by his assumed superiority of judgment.

A Word With the Reformer.

Too many men would rather be recognized as "radical" than as right.

Too many persons set about reforming the world before informing themselves.

The trouble with the man who can see no hope ahead of him is simply that he is headed the wrong way.

Analyze almost any radical "ism" and you will find that it is composed mainly of solecism and cynicism.

It is the "dreamer" who keeps the world from going to sleep altogether.

About the least effective way of advocating any particular theory of reform is to cast discredit upon other theories.

The force of a truth may be better evidenced by the opposition than by the approval with which it is at first greeted.

It is easy enough to arouse enthusiasm with a new idea, but not so easy to compel thought by the expression of an old truth.

The man in the dark follows the cry of "Progress" without really knowing whether it comes from ahead or from behind.

You can't teach a "new" trade unionist old tricks. He insists upon learning in his own way and at the cost of his own bumps.

Novelty in reform ideas, as in everything else, will attract a crowd. But novelty and soundness are entirely different things.

The agitator can afford to soar as far as Pegasus will carry him; but the leader must stay within reasoning distance of his fellows.

The reformer who advances beyond sight of his fellows frequently doubles on his tracks and heads backward without knowing it.

We admire the man who "dares to be in the right of two or three," provided his daring is not inspired mainly by a desire for notoriety.

After all, it frequently happens that what we call progress denotes nothing more than that we have stopped short of positive retrogression.

Much of that which passes as "progressive" and "advanced" in the thought of to-day is merely outgrown notion expressed in a strange vocabulary.

The dilettante reformer would administer the truth to the "upper classes" as we administer medicine to a child—with a good deal of sweetening. But the man of sense knows that a dose of facts, to be efficacious at all, must be taken in all its unpalatableness.

The world's most useful citizens have been merely "dreamers," in the esteem of their fellows. The whole progress of humankind is but a realization of their visions.

The work of reform succeeds or fails in proportion as it is shaped to conform with conditions as they are or with conditions as they might be—in proportion as it is practical or speculative.

Generally speaking, if the man who considers himself "ahead of the times" would pause and look backward he would find that he is merely proceeding in a direction opposite to that of the times.

The reformer who cites the past only to contemn it resembles the navigator who should attempt to shape a course without knowledge of the time at first meridian. Both are bound to be very much "at sea" in the end.

Local conditions are poor bases by which to judge principles. He who confines his observations on the subject of gravitation to the operations of a kite or a balloon is likely to be seriously at fault in his conclusions.

In reckoning upon the strength of his following the expounder of "radical" reforms should be careful to distinguish between those who are convinced and those who are merely amused. The most eccentric attracts the most attention.

If men would take trouble to verify those reports of current happenings which they use in substantiation of their views and in proof of the progress thereof a good many theories of reform would be deprived of their only appearance of public acceptation. As it is, most of these reports are unimportant because untrue.

Recognition of the Union.

"Recognition of the union," after all, implies merely a guarantee of good faith on the part of the employer toward his employes.

The importance of the demand for "recognition of the union" may be very well judged by the amount of opposition it encounters from the employing class.

About the only argument (?) left the non-unionist is that of the fox who had lost his brush, to-wit, that brushes are altogether too common.

There can not be any question of the "sacredness of contract" with a trade union whose actual existence is assailed. The contract itself is abrogated by the act of assault.

If consistency were a marketable commodity the average employer would probably keep in stock an entirely different brand of anti-union argument (?).

The man who insists upon "running his own business" would be more consistent and more successful if he would recognize the line between his business and the business of the human race.

Labor can not make an improvement in its own conditions without breaking the friendship (?) of the employer who has assumed the whole right to attend to that sort of thing—in his own good time.

The employer who is most strenuous in claiming the right to "run his own business" is frequently most insistent in the claim that it is the duty of his employes to attend to the advertising end thereof.

The organized workers may agree to the employer's proposal to deal with his employes "as individuals" as soon as the employer agrees to abandon the trust, corporation, company, and copartnership and go back to the primitive relations of master and man. And that will be plenty soon enough.

The interests of labor and capital are one, declare some persons. But the very frequency and insistency with which the statement is made would seem to argue a doubt as to its correctness.

The Daniel who should come to judgment on the contract between a trade union and a corporation would find that, according to the latter's construction, there is more than a pound of flesh nominated in the bond.

Business men would do well to remember that the logical remedy for any disadvantage in competition suffered by them through the employment of organized labor is not less trade unionism in their own business but more trade unionism in the business of their competitors.

It is a mistake on the part of labor to attempt the refutation of the "class" theory by insistence upon the mutuality of the interests of labor and capital. These are merely elements of the same principle—the productive capacity. To speak, therefore, of the mutuality of interest between labor and capital as of two principles is of itself to recognize two classes, the laborer and the capitalist.

To Certain Critics.

Even the beasts of the field know the value of sticking together.

Consider the opponent of trade unionism, and you will find one who lacks system in most of his thoughts and actions.

The man who questions the continued growth and success of the labor movement pays a very small compliment to the potentialities of human nature.

It is quite natural, of course, but none the less significant, that most of the fault-finding concerning trade unionism comes from those outside of that institution.

Some persons can't help opposing trade unionism for much the same reason that some persons can't help jumping from a great height. Lightheadedness does it.

Frequently the wisdom of any proposed step may be judged as an inverse ratio to the amount of condemnation it receives. In this as in all other matters we consider the source.

When we are inclined to marvel at the denseness of the person who questions the value of trade unionism, let us remember that the mole, too, probably cavils at that other law of nature, the recurrence of day and night.

The man who confines himself too closely to the facts of the labor movement it as little qualified to judge the scope and direction of that movement as is the man who stands right up to the cornerstone to judge the height and symmetry of a cathedral. In both cases distance lends proportion as well as enchantment to the view.

The labor movement, like every other movement that moves, is subject to a good deal of uncomplimentary remark from those who stand still and sneer. Probably the mule who looks over the fence and wobbles an ear at the lightning express has a rather small opinion of railroad speed.

The man who in these days will seriously debate the affirmative of the question, "Resolved, That trade unions are a menace to the prosperity of the country," belongs to that order of persons who, when the case goes against them, find their only relief in cursing the court.

General Observations.

Even death itself may shortly have to give way to the trust as the "great leveler."

The man who opposes Chinese exclusion is interesting chiefly as the exception that proves the rule.

The "international merger" business will not reach an ideal perfection until the workers of the world go into it.

The success of any civilization is to be measured by the comfort of its workers, not by the affluence of its drones.

The non-unionists are the comets of the social system. You can never tell at what moment they may collide with each other.

After all, the only difference between the labor trust and the capitalist trust is the difference between altruism and selfishness.

The community which leases its lawbreakers has no logical claim to respect for its laws, and in fact receives very little of that.

The unassimilativeness of the Chinese is generally cited as a point against the race, whereas, logically regarded, it is a point in its favor. We prefer to remain unassimilated.

The "crime of dying rich" is the crime of living to accumulate riches. It can not be atoned for by giving in alms to one, that which has been taken in greed from another.

Most of the arguments made in favor of cheap labor would be absolutely invulnerable if applied to the cheap laborer. Applied to the American laborer, they are thin enough to blow peas through.

Labor Day affords the opportunity of reviewing the facts of the labor movement, the facts not of to-day only but of all time, marshaled in the order of their proportion and chronology.

The efficacy of the labor aphorism depends not so much upon its literal truthfulness as upon the fact that the unbeliever must think to the extent of half a column or so in order to disprove it.

When reflecting upon the power of money it should be remembered that after all it can not be eaten. The producers of food, clothing, and shelter constitute the power that dominates in the last event.

The saying, "A dollar saved is a dollar earned," like most generalizations, is subject to modification. A dollar saved in the purchase of a cheap-labor product is a dollar lost to the cause of decent living conditions.

In a state of machine production the "superior race" is that whose character most closely resembles the characteristics of machinery—a large capacity for labor, little demand for rest, and no requirement for recreation.

In the sentimental view Chinese exclusion is regarded as a denial of the Brotherhood of Man; practically, however, it is but an application of the principle of self-preservation, which recognizes no question of lineage.

The use of language to disguise thought has never been more clearly exemplified than in the term "subsidy," meaning the appropriation of public moneys to private purposes. The real idea involved could be more correctly expressed by a word of less length and much wider currency.